

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

1956
Su 3 Su 33
Cap. 2

U. S. DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY
MAR 9 - 1964
CURRENT SERIES RECEIVED

SUGAR REPORTS

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

WASHINGTON, D.C.

FEBRUARY 1964

NO. 141

CONTENTS

PAGE

1.	MARKET REVIEW	2 - 4
2.	ADDRESS BY TOM O. MURPHY, DIRECTOR, SUGAR POLICY STAFF, ASCS, AT ANNUAL MEETING OF CALIFORNIA BEET GROWERS ASSOCIATION	5 - 11
3.	(a) ACTIONS RELATING TO 1964 SUGAR SUPPLIES	12 - 13
	(b) OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS	14
4.	STATISTICAL SERIES	15 - 29
	(a) Highlights	15
	(b) Supply and Disposition Summary	16
	January-November 1963	
	(c) Disposition and stocks:	
	January-November 1963 and 1962	17
	To end December 1963 and 1962	17
	(d) Mainland Production and Quota Charges:	
	January-November 1963 and 1962	18
	(e) Refiners and Importers receipts by Source of Supply:	
	January-November 1963 and 1962	18 - 19
	(f) Status of Quota and Balance as of December 31, 1963 and January 31, 1964	20 - 23
	(g) Deliveries by States:	
	November 1963	24
	to end November 1963 and 1962	25 - 26
	(h) Sugar Prices by Areas	27
	(i) Sugar prices compared with corn sweetener prices	28
	(j) Refined sugar production and stocks	29
5.	REFERENCE GUIDE TO SUGAR REPORTS PUBLISHED DURING 1960, 1961, 1962, and 1963	30 - 36
6.	SUPPLEMENT TO VOL. II SUGAR STATISTICS	37 - 38

MARKET REVIEW

At the beginning of January the spot price for raw sugar duty paid and delivered at New York was 9.40 cents per pound, but by the end of the month it had dropped to 8.25 cents with the average for the month at 9.29 cents. The January average spot price for sugar delivered to other countries was 10.64 cents per pound, or 2.28 cents per pound above the United States price on a comparable basis (deducting duty, freight and unloading costs from the United States price and adding bag allowance).

The wholesale quotations for refined sugar at the end of January were generally at the same level as at the beginning of the month. As of January 31, 1964, the following wholesale prices for refined sugar were quoted:

	<u>Cane</u> (100 lb. paper bags)	<u>Beet</u>
Northeast	12.95	
New York metropolitan area	12.85	
Southeast	12.15	
Gulf	12.45	
Eastern beet		11.25
Chicago-West	11.45	11.25
Lower Pacific Coast	12.00	12.00 ^{1/}
<u>Northwest-Intermountain</u>	12.00	10.50

^{1/} One processor quoting 11.05

It should be pointed out that the above are quoted prices and actual prices may have varied considerably. For example, both cane and beet sugar have been selling at 9.55 cents per pound in the Lower Pacific Coast and at 9.50 cents in the Northwest-Intermountain territory to regular customers in normal quantities. These prices have been announced to continue through February.

The President in his message on Agriculture given the Congress on January 31, 1964, recommended the removal of marketing restrictions on the sale of domestically produced sugar during calendar year 1964.

The proposed legislation had been sent to the Congress on December 20, 1963. The President stated that legislative recommendations regarding foreign sugar supplies after 1964 would be made early in this session on the basis of an intensive study now being made to strengthen the United States sugar program.

Stocks of sugar in the hands of primary distributors and users are at record levels. With increased supplies made available from the larger production in domestic areas and the currently committed foreign sugar, including that from country quotas, the overall supply of sugar is expected to be sufficient for 1964 consumption and a continuing high level of stocks.

Domestic beet sugar production during January 1964 was about 480,000 tons or 216,000 tons more than was produced in January 1963. The size of this increase is attributable to the large quantity of sugar beets that had been harvested at year end but had not been processed into sugar. Beet sugar production in February 1963 totaled 74,000 tons and it is expected that production during February 1964 will be very much greater than that amount.

Sugar production from the 1963-64 Florida crop through February 7, 1964 totaled 248,000 tons as compared with 209,000 tons at the same-time last year. An additional 172,000 tons or 45 percent of the total 381,000 tons production from last year's crop were produced after February 7, 1963. Sugar production from the Louisiana crop was completed in January and totaled about 760,000 tons. This was the largest production of record and exceeded the previous highest production total, from the 1961 crop, by 110,000 tons or 17 percent.

Deliveries of sugar for United States consumption during January 1964 totaled approximately 605,000 tons. While this was 125,000 tons below the January 1963 delivery total, it was only slightly below deliveries for the month of January during the 5-year period 1959-63.

The Protocol for the prolongation of the International Sugar Agreement of 1958 which was adopted July 4, 1963 in London was submitted to the United States Senate for ratification on December 4, 1963. It was brought before the Senate on January 30, 1964 and was ratified on that date when two-thirds of the members present voted in the affirmative. The Protocol has been ratified by a sufficient number of countries and has been declared effective as of January 1, 1964.

Dr. Ralph E. Stedman, C.M.G., Executive Director of the International Sugar Council since January 1960, died suddenly on January 31 in London at the age of 61. Mr. C. Politoff, secretary of the Council, is acting in charge of Council affairs at present.

A talk by Tom O. Murphy, Director,
Sugar Policy Staff, Agricultural Stabilization
and Conservation Service, United States
Department of Agriculture, at the annual meeting
of the California Beet Growers Association in
San Francisco, Friday, January 31, 1964

I feel privileged and honored to have this chance to talk with you today and I thank Owen Rice, your President and Gordon Lyons, your Executive Manager for inviting me to participate with you in your annual meeting. With the passing of each year, these meetings become more and more important.

A little less than two months ago I spoke in New York. I will not bore you by rehashing what I said there, but you would not want me to say one thing in New York and another thing when I am talking to the sugar-beet growers in California. To avoid any misunderstanding on that score and to save anyone who may be curious the trouble of ploughing through that talk, I will list briefly the major matters I talked about then:

First, production estimates for the 1963-64 crop and prospects for the 1964-65 crop clearly suggest larger world supplies in the offing.

Second, higher prices have significantly curtailed the two million ton annual increase in world consumption which did exist until recently.

Third, the two other post-war periods of high world sugar prices differed fundamentally from the present one because they resulted solely from sudden war-scare surges of demand which soon abated.

Fourth, the increased world production now and during the next few years is resulting largely from short-range type investment -- more fertilizer, more careful cultivation and harvesting and the like -- the kind that responds quickly to higher prices.

Fifth, if the rate of sugar consumption growth is reestablished through lower prices, (the major problem facing sugar people) more long-term type investment will be needed before the end of this decade. Whether

and where in the world it occurs is important to all sugar producers and consumers.

Sixth, serious consideration of the best method of assuring sugar imports to the United States at reasonable prices must start with the frank recognition that we no longer have the Cuban "warehouse" to counter-balance our domestic program.

Two other things said then were, first that there are indications that the United States market for sugar has ceased growing at its usual rate and may not be growing at all, and second that the United States has adequate supplies of sugar in 1964. Both are of prime interest to you, so let me discuss what has since occurred in these fields.

On the first point, we can all observe the inroads being made by corn sweeteners and synthetic sweeteners in direct response to higher prices for sucrose. We now have the record of the marketings of corn sweeteners in the first three quarters of last year which shows that the sales of this alternative sweetener increased by 90,000 tons. Note please that this does not include whatever increases occurred in the last quarter. Since food processors were changing their formulas as the year progressed, -- very little change occurred in the first quarter -- there is the likelihood that the rate of growth of corn sweeteners was even greater in the last quarter of last year and may continue to be so this year. When you consider that the total national market for all sweeteners normally increases at about 175,000 tons per year, the meaning of this fact becomes clear.

There are no similar statistical benchmarks for the increased use of synthetics but we all know how much is being spent on advertising in this field and some of us have opened our own refrigerators and found the synthetically sweetened soft drinks staring us right in the eye. This, I think, is a matter of real concern to the sugarbeet growers in California, especially in view of the remarkable expansion of sugarbeet acreage which occurred here last year.

On the second point, we now know that the supplies of sugar charged to 1963 marketing quotas and on hand at the beginning of this year were three quarter million tons larger than the comparable figure at the beginning of last year. In addition, the effective inventory of mainland beet sugar and mainland cane sugar not yet charged to quotas was one quar-

ter million tons larger at the beginning of this year than on January 1, 1963. The Department has asked the Congress to amend the Sugar Act to permit unlimited marketings of domestically produced sugar in 1964. If the Congress acts favorably, much of the beet sugar can be marketed in the early months of the year at the time when demand is good and thus it will not overhang a weaker market later on.

In addition to this one million tons by which beginning of the year sugar stocks are higher than the record level of January 1, 1962, foreign countries have fully subscribed to the one million tons of global quota sugar needed this year and virtually all of the 175,000 tons of sugar by which production in Puerto Rico is expected to fall below that area's quota. Fifty-seven percent of the global sugar will arrive before July 31, all of it before October 31. Half of the deficit proration will arrive before June 30. The balance is from the Philippines which, as I understand it, will import only to the United States. When the deficit proration sugar from there arrives is inconsequential because it matters not whether the regular quota or the deficit sugar arrives first.

In addition to the 1,175,000 tons of global and deficit sugar now unqualifiedly committed, foreign countries earlier had indicated that they would supply their individual country quotas. Collectively -- excluding the Dominican Republic which we did not query at the time because we did not then have diplomatic relations -- they had also earlier indicated that they could supply still a further half million tons of global quota sugar. Some of this sugar is not eligible since we have authorized only sugar which can arrive here by October 31st and some represented production available for earlier shipment but which, due to the vagaries of nature, the countries did not feel justified in formally and unqualifiedly committing at this early date in the year.

The sugar available from our extraordinarily high inventories, from marketings by domestic areas, and from importations of country quota, global quota, and deficit proration is sufficient to provide for consumption this year and for ending stocks much higher than they have ever been, save only for the enormous quantity on hand at the beginning of this month. For the entire year then our supplies are ample. Some people believe however, that there may still be a problem early in the year. The other side of this picture, in addition to the large starting inventories, is that prices are so much weaker for the latter part of the year that prudent marketers have strong incentive to sell their sugar as early as they can ship it in order to avoid competing in a weaker market in the last half of the year.

Let me take this occasion to congratulate on two scores the farmers who grow sugarbeets and the companies which process them into beet sugar: First that they were successful in producing a tremendous crop of sugar when it was needed. Second, that although they raised their prices last year they did not raise them as high as the cane sugar refiners did. Cane refiners were in a difficult situation -- essentially they improve the quality of and market in refined form raw sugar, mostly received from abroad, and so must price their product more or less in line with raw sugar prices.

I imagine that all of you share my feelings on the first point but there may be some disagreement as to our views regarding the second. Naturally everyone likes to get as much as he can for his product but sometimes the benefits obtained from high prices for a year or so cost an awful lot in the long run -- perhaps some of you have fathers who were in the sugar business in the twenties who know something about this. If you do, I need say no more. Nevertheless, let me explain why I think the second is so important to you as growers who expect to be producing sugar crops for years to come.

Sugar consumers having supported the sugar program for so many years feel that they are entitled to have the Government and everyone who has benefited from the sugar program exert all of their efforts to provide sugar for them as nearly as possible in line with the over-all objectives of the Sugar Act, at least to the extent possible in a free market -- free in the sense that once sugar comes into the quota system it competes freely across the board throughout the United States.

There was a time when beet sugar constituted such a small part of all the sugar sold in the United States that beet sugar growers, perhaps, felt that they could take an indifferent attitude as to whether the total market continued to grow or not. Besides, up until ten or twelve years ago, the price of other crops was more attractive in relation to sugarbeets than has since been the case. Decidedly, this attitude is feasible no longer. Refined beet sugar now represents such a large part of the national market and particularly of the market in western States that beet growers must in their own interest consider carefully the problems of sugar consumers because they are also their own problems.

Beet growers generally, and particularly those in California, have been supplying a steadily growing share of the market in recent years. I think you have liked this. I think you like to grow sugarbeets, but a look at

some other farm commodities suggests that over the long run it is difficult to get both volume and price benefits. One or the other, yes, but hardly both.

It is like carrying coals to Newcastle to tell California growers that improved methods and cost control are the surest answers to more profitable operations. You have amply demonstrated your keen interest in technological advances but like other good things, this one cannot be emphasized too much -- or too often -- even to you. As you know, the Department of Agriculture for many years has been making significant contributions through physical research to progress in all phases of sugarbeet culture. Your own industry does the same and as farmers you have been quick to change your methods as newer techniques have become perfected. This is the surest, safest and most rewarding path toward higher profits. In our society, in the long run, it is the only one.

Returning now to the revenue side of the picture. The Department has answered numerous inquiries in the past year as to why the direct payment made to sugar farmers under the Sugar Act is not reduced on a compensatory basis to recognize the larger market returns which growers received last year. We think we answered those questions adequately in view of the circumstances but the thing that should impress you is that so many expressed real shock because they had recently learned that what they term support payments were being made irrespective of market returns. They simply started with the assumption that the program for a supported commodity naturally provided lower direct Government payments when market returns were higher than usual. Interest in this as a matter of principle has not diminished.

There have been no production restrictions on the sugarbeet crop since the year when the United States ceased importing sugar from Cuba. In a general sort of a way, this same situation applies in the other countries of the world. Sometimes the restrictions were removed a little later but they are all gone now. The world seems in a fair way to filling for several years to come the gap created by the sharp deterioration of sugar production in Cuba. The long period of the sugar market characterized by short supplies and high prices, I believe, is nearing its end, unless, of course, the 1964-65 crop were to be subjected to an unusually large number of unusually severe disasters. The numerous plans for expansion in the various parts of the world suggest that the relentless search for markets which has marked most of the post-war years may shortly be resumed. The Sugar Act provides one of the legs for the pro-

tection to United States farmers from the buffeting of these forces. The other leg must be the continued search for and willingness to use improved methods of production. Even within the domestic system, competition for a favored place is keen. One area loses as another forges ahead and within an area one region gains as another loses.

New localities are anxious to get started. The desire of farmers in the United States to grow sugarbeets is startling, even to those in the Department of Agriculture who felt that they were pretty well up on this sort of thing. You have one new factory now operating at Mendota, the first completed in this country since 1954. The Panhandle of Texas will have one operating this year. Both the Red River Valley and central New York State expect to have new factories in operation in 1965. Twenty-one localities are competing for the two factory allocations available for 1966. The first hearing we had concerning the reserve acreage provision in the Sugar Act ran on for three days in September 1962. We were surprised, but the second one which was held last month consumed four days. Obviously, the United States is one of the exceptional countries where the desire to commit long-term capital occurred early. The mainland cane area has eight new raw sugar factories, as you know.

The enlargement of the beet sugar industry inevitably poses marketing problems. As an example, sugar prices on the Pacific Coast were substantially the same as in the northeast until 1959. Last year, your price was 1.2 cents per pound below the northeast price but this is one of the things for which I congratulated you earlier and which I sincerely believe is very much to your long term advantage. But in all three years 1960, 1961 and 1962 your prices were about one-half cent per pound below the eastern price. The differential in those earlier years was in no way influenced by either your desire or the desire of the beet sugar processors to sell for one penny less than the market would bear. The differential then stemmed strictly from the fact that sugar is in surplus on the Pacific Coast and it costs heavily to ship thousands of miles eastward. When sugar prices return to normal, the long term advantage to you of the differential will disappear but the involuntary portion of it is apt to linger on. I know that you and the directors and officers of your Association recognize that there is a marketing problem involved in the benefits you have obtained from larger volume. It is sort of like the thorn among the roses. It is pretty hard to grow the one without the other. Without doubt, you are studying the problem deeply to determine where the best balance lies.

The sugar program has just come through a difficult year. Price stability had always been the feature of the program that everyone agreed they liked. Last year, although the price for all raw sugar shipped into this country, regardless of its quota classification, was 1.25 cents per pound below the world market price, it also was a little more than 1.50 cents per pound above the Sugar Act price reference point. At times the price to the consumer was even higher than the annual averages suggest. I think in the long term interests of everybody affected by the sugar program, we should all strive to reestablish a stable situation.

With first things first, it seems to me desirable that the Secretary of Agriculture be relieved by the Congress of the obligation to impose marketing allotments on sugar processors in the mainland beet and cane areas for this year. If this occurs soon, the extra beet sugar now available from the old crop can be marketed early in the year with clearly apparent benefits to farmers, processors and consumers. If the sugar processors can be assured that they are not facing marketing allotments for this calendar year, they will schedule all of their sugar from the old crop to be marketed in the first three quarters of the year. Thus, they have the benefit of selling at a time when sugar futures indicate higher prices and a stronger market than in later months. Similarly, consumers can get the sugar when they want it. If, on the other hand, this sugar has to be stored, eventually at some time in the future, this year or some other year, under whatever type of sugar program is in existence, it must be sold in a much weaker market.

As to longer term legislation, the Department has not yet completely firmed up its own position but I think that it is safe to say that there is general agreement throughout the Administration that whatever kind of legislation finally is passed it must provide greater security of supply and greater price stability. This can be done. Probably there is more than one way of doing it. The Department welcomes suggestions and continues to study all approaches.

Let me again express my appreciation for the opportunity to meet with you and candidly discuss the sugar situation.

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS RELATING TO SUGAR SUPPLIES BEING
CONSIDERED FOR 1964

Allocations of Global Quota and Deficit Proration Sugar: (January 21,
1964)

The U. S. Department of Agriculture today announced that the 1,000,000 tons of global quota sugar authorized for purchase and importation this year have been fully subscribed and 163,000 tons of the 186,000-ton deficit, mainly a shortfall expected in marketing from Puerto Rico, also have been prorated and subscribed.

Of this total of 1,163,000 tons, about 56 percent is scheduled to arrive in the United States during the first seven months of the year, 37 percent by Oct. 31, and 7 percent -- representing 88,000 tons of deficit prorated to the Republic of the Philippines -- may come in at any time during the year.

A table listing the individual countries and the global quota and deficit prorations for each are shown on page 13. Statutory quotas are also shown for all countries.

<u>Country</u>	<u>Global Quota and Deficit Commitments</u>	<u>Basic Quotas</u>	<u>Total Entitlements</u>
	<u>Short tons, raw value</u>		
Mexico	284,958	192,096	477,054
Australia	175,000	40,366	215,366
Republic of the Philippines	134,263	1,050,000	1,184,263
South Africa	101,872	20,326	122,198
India	96,195	20,326	116,521
British West Indies	52,170	91,325	143,495
Republic of China	48,300	35,499	83,799
Costa Rica	47,470	25,193	72,663
Fiji Islands	44,828	10,020	54,848
Peru	33,314	192,096	225,410
Ecuador	30,200	25,193	55,393
Dominican Republic	21,840	322,096	343,936
Guatemala	21,200	20,326	41,526
Nicaragua	20,555	25,193	45,748
Madagascar	11,550	0	11,550
Southern Rhodesia	10,600	0	10,600
El Salvador	10,373	10,306	20,679
Panama	10,260	8,832	19,092
British Honduras	5,250	974	6,224
French West Indies	2,565	30,346	32,911
Brazil	0	182,363	182,363
Colombia	0	30,346	30,346
Haiti	0	20,326	20,326
Argentina	0	20,000	20,000
Ireland	0	10,000	10,000
Belgium	0	182	182
Total	<u>1,162,763</u>	<u>2,383,730</u>	<u>3,546,493</u>

OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONSDate announcedNature of action

January 7,
1964

Determination of rates of sugar recoverability, 1963 crop, Beet Sugar Area. (See January 7, 1964 Federal Register).

January 10,
1964

Commitment of 29,500 acres from the national sugarbeet acreage reserve to farms in counties in central New York. The commitment, for the 1965 crop, is expected to yield about 50,000 short tons of sugar.

The reserve acreage is available to farmers in central New York counties, including Cayuga, Onondaga, Ontario, Oswego, Seneca, Tompkins, Wayne and Yates, who will grow sugarbeets for delivery to the beet sugar factory proposed for construction in the vicinity of Auburn, N.Y. (See January 16, 1964 Federal Register).

February 6,
1964

Announced that minimum wage rates for Virgin Islands sugarcane fieldworkers during the calendar year 1964 will be 15 cents per hour higher than the rates provided in the 1963 wage determination. (See February 11, 1964 Federal Register).

STATISTICAL SERIES IN THIS ISSUEHIGHLIGHTS

1. December 1963 sugar deliveries for continental U. S. consumption, 950,000 short tons, raw value (preliminary) up about 313,000 from November 1963 and up 124,000 tons from December 1962. January-December 1963 deliveries 9,989,000 short tons, raw value, up about 237,000 tons from the January-December 1962 period. Final data for November 1963 deliveries 637,000 -- previously published preliminary as 613,000 tons.

2. Primary distributors' stocks December 31, 1963 were 2,468,248 short tons, raw value (preliminary) up 208,000 tons from a year earlier and up 548,000 tons from end November 1963. During December refiners' stocks increased by about 431,000 tons, beet processors' stocks by about 96,000 tons, importers of direct consumption sugar stocks by about 18,000 tons and mainland sugarcane processors' stocks by about 2,000 tons.

3. Charges to quotas January 1 to January 31, 1964 were 1,452,541 short tons, raw value, leaving a balance of 8,347,459 tons to be supplied within the 9,800,000 ton total.

4. Regionally, January-November deliveries, 1963 as compared with 1962, were up to all 5 regions -- North Central 3.4 percent, Middle Atlantic 1.0 percent, Western 0.9 percent, New England 0.5 percent, and Southern 0.2 percent.

Table 1. - Sugar supply and disposition by primary distributors, January-November 1963

(Short tons, raw value)

Item	Beet	Importers	Main-land cane	Refiners		Net total
	processors		processors ^{1/}	Raw	Refined	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
SUPPLY						
1. Inventory Jan. 1, 1963	1,368,426	27,395	11,938	600,060 ^{2/}	252,748 ^{2/}	2,260,567
2. Production and movement						
a. Received as direct-consumption sugar	0	205,322	0	0	0	205,322
b. Produced from beets or cane	2,043,434	0	671,700	74,855	41,232)	
Less deliveries to refiners	0	0	600,872	0	0)	2,230,349 ^{3/}
c. Receipts of raws by refiners	0	0	0	6,337,584 ^{4/}	0)	78,990 ^{5/}
Less raws melted	0	0	0	6,416,574	0)	
d. Refined from raws melted	0	0	0	0	6,376,555	6,376,555
e. Adjustments	-96	- 1,545	- 1,780	+ 1,176	+ 1,910	- 335
f. Sub-total	2,043,338	203,777	69,048	- 2,959	6,419,697	8,732,901
3. Net total supply	3,411,764	231,172	80,986	597,101	6,672,445	10,993,468
DISPOSITION						
4. Distribution for						
a. Quota purposes	2,484,905	201,673	33,731	15,821	6,302,623	9,038,753
b. Export	0	0	0	0	28,413	28,413
c. Livestock feed	0	4,417	0	0	2,047	6,464
d. Sub-total	2,484,905	206,090	33,731	15,821	6,333,083	9,073,630
5. Inventory Nov. 30, 1963	926,859	25,082	47,255	581,280 ^{6/}	339,362 ^{6/}	1,919,838
6. Total distribution and inventory	3,411,764	231,172	80,986	597,101	6,672,445	10,993,468

^{1/} Establishments that acquire no raw sugar from others for refining. Processor-refiners are included with refiners.

^{2/} Includes Mainland cane sugar not charged to quota: Raws, 36,791; Refined, 16,399; Total, 53,190.

^{3/} Production less deliveries of raw sugar to refiners.

^{4/} Includes 551,610 tons delivered from mainland cane processors.

^{5/} Receipts of raw sugar by refiners less melt.

^{6/} Includes mainland cane sugar not charged to quota: Raws, 45,965; Refined, 23,855; Total, 69,820.

Table 2.- Distribution of sugar by primary distributors, January-November 1963 and 1962

Item	1963	1962	Change 1962 to 1963
<u>Short tons, raw value</u>			
<u>Continental United States</u>			
Refiners' raw	15,821	5,107	+ 10,714
Refiners' refined	6,333,083	6,479,788	-146,705
Sub-total	6,348,904	6,484,895	-135,991
Beet processors' refined	2,484,905	2,189,943	+294,962
Importers' direct consumption	206,090	316,287	-110,197
Mainland sugarcane processors'	33,731	25,594	+ 8,137
Total	9,073,630	9,016,719	+ 56,911
For: Export	28,413	57,872	- 29,459
Livestock feed	6,464	32,518	- 26,054
Continental consumption ^{1/}	9,038,753	8,926,329	+112,424
<u>Puerto Rico</u>	109,219	100,206	+ 9,013
<u>Hawaii</u>	39,525	42,507	- 2,982

^{1/} Includes deliveries for United States Military forces at home and abroad.

Table 3.- Stocks of sugar held by primary distributors in the continental United States, November 30, 1963 and 1962

Item	1963	1962	Change 1962 to 1963
<u>Short tons, raw value</u>			
Refiners' raw	581,280	516,142	+ 65,138
Refiners' refined	339,362	263,515	+ 75,847
Sub-total ^{1/}	920,642	779,657	+140,985
Beet processors' refined	926,859	1,042,505	-115,646
Importers' direct consumption	25,082	19,089	+ 5,993
Mainland sugarcane processors'	47,255	51,844	- 4,589
Total	1,919,838	1,893,095	+ 26,743

^{1/} Included mainland cane sugar not charged to quota: 1963- Raws, 45,965; Refined, 23,855, Total, 69,820; 1962 - Raws, 23,631; Refined, 30,974; Total, 44,605.

Table 4.- Distribution of sugar by primary distributors in the continental United States, December and January-December 1963 and 1962

Item	1963 ^{1/}	1962
	December	Jan.-December
<u>Short tons, raw value</u>		
Refiners	448,182	6,797,086
Beet processors' refined	481,420	2,966,325
Importers' direct consumption	5,005	211,095
Mainland sugarcane processors'	15,849	49,580
Total	950,456	10,024,086
For: Export	n.a.	28,413
Livestock feed	n.a.	6,464
Continental consumption ^{2/}	950,456	9,989,209

^{1/} Preliminary. ^{2/} Includes deliveries for U.S. military forces at home and abroad.

Table 5.- Stocks of sugar held by primary distributors in the continental United States, January 4, 1964 and December 31, 1962

Item	1963 ^{1/}	1962	Change 1962 to 1963
<u>Short tons, raw value</u>			
Refiners' raw	1,003,490	600,060	+ 403,430
Refiners' refined	348,297	252,748	+ 95,549
Sub-total	1,351,787	852,808	+498,979
Beet processors' refined	1,023,671	1,368,426	-344,755
Importers' direct consumption	43,143	27,395	+ 15,748
Mainland sugarcane processors'	49,647	11,938	+ 37,709
Total	2,468,248	2,260,567	+ 207,681

^{1/} Preliminary.

Table 6.- Mainland sugar: Production and quota charges January-November 1963 and 1962

Item	1963	1962	Change 1962 to 1963
Short tons, raw value			
<u>Production</u>			
Mainland cane	783,712	485,200	+298,512
Domestic beet	2,043,338	1,963,893	+ 79,445
Total	2,827,050	2,449,093	+377,957
<u>Quota charges:</u>			
Mainland cane:			
Louisiana sugarcane processors			
For further processing	307,858	186,290	+121,568
For direct-consumption	15,336	18,295	- 2,959
Louisiana processor-refiners	97,256	108,066	- 10,810
Florida sugarcane processors	311,315	164,740	+146,575
Sub-total	731,765	477,391	+254,374
Beet processors	2,484,905	2,189,943	+294,962
Total	3,216,670	2,667,334	+549,336

Table 7.- Sugar receipts of refiners and importers by source of supply^{1/} January-November 1963 and 1962

Source of supply	Raw sugar		Direct-consumption sugar		Total	
	1963	1962	1963	1962	1963	1962
Short tons, raw value						
<u>Offshore</u>						
<u>Foreign</u>						
Cuban	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dominican Republic	563,501	823,251	0	15,940	563,501	839,191
Mexico	367,659	389,083	0	8,504	367,659	397,587
Peru	369,080	493,922	0	5,196	369,080	499,118
Philippines	1,024,164	1,106,836	36,407	42,742	1,060,571	1,149,578
Other countries (See details in Table 9)	1,759,156	1,405,330	27,319	54,197	1,786,475	1,459,527
Sub-total	4,083,560	4,218,422	63,726	126,579	4,147,286	4,345,001
<u>Domestic</u>						
Hawaii	956,259	1,021,830	0 ^{2/}	5,741 ^{2/}	956,259	1,027,571
Puerto Rico	726,366	756,813	141,596	146,851	867,962	903,664
Virgin Islands	15,524	10,750	0	0	15,524	10,750
Sub-total	1,698,149	1,789,393	141,596	152,592	1,839,745	1,941,985
Total offshore	5,781,709	6,007,815	205,322	279,171	5,987,031	6,286,986
Mainland cane area	626,465	406,364	41,232 ^{3/}	38,234 ^{3/}	667,697	444,598
Acquired for reprocessing and samples	4,265	3,786	0	0	4,265	3,786
Grand total	6,412,439	6,417,965	246,554	317,405	6,658,993	6,735,370

1/ Includes sugar as detailed in Table 8. 2/ Refined sugar received by refiners. 3/ Refined sugar produced direct from cane by processor-refiner.

Table 8.- Receipts of quota-exempt and over-quota sugar included in Table 7.

Purpose	Refiners		Importers		Total	
	1963	1962	1963	1962	1963	1962
Short tons, raw value						
For: Export	10,967	62,063	0	7,415	10,967	69,478
Livestock feed	0	8,066	16,776	40,171	16,776	48,237
Later release:						
Bonded	523	0	0	0	523	0
In customs custody	0	0	0	101	0	101
Total	11,490	70,129	16,776	47,687	28,266	117,816

Table 9.- Sugar receipts of refiners and importers by source of supply. Detail of other foreign countries, January-November 1963 and 1962

Countries	Raw sugar		Direct-consumption sugar		Total	
	1963	1962	1963	1962	1963	1962
	Short tons, raw value					
Argentina	206,164	9,761	0	0	206,164	9,761
Australia	223,593	160,915	0	0	223,593	160,915
Belgium	7,365	0	0	3,709	7,365	3,709
Brazil	341,741	354,371	0	0	341,741	354,371
British Honduras	1,712	0	0	0	1,712	0
British West Indies	135,862	165,979	0	460	135,862	166,439
Canada	0	0	10	3,686	10	3,686
China, Republic of	71,272	105,718	0	0	71,272	105,718
Colombia	45,028	52,975	0	1,186	45,028	54,161
Costa Rica	40,649	24,625	0	1,902	40,649	26,527
Ecuador	50,852	66,983	0	0	50,852	66,983
El Salvador	18,967	18,606	0	0	18,967	18,606
Fiji Islands	36,552	15,764	0	0	36,552	15,764
France	22,947	0	5,021	0	27,968	0
French West Indies	94,312	59,091	0	0	94,312	59,091
Germany, West	0	0	10	11	10	11
Guatemala	51,059	23,367	0	4,995	51,059	28,362
Haiti	40,433	33,938	0	3,694	40,433	37,632
Hong Kong	0	0	10	53	10	53
India	118,969	127,350	0	0	118,969	127,350
Ireland	0	0	6,451	7,449	6,451	7,449
Japan	0	0	1	1	1	1
Mauritius	54,427	13,474	0	0	54,427	13,474
Netherlands	0	0	0	295	0	295
Nicaragua	32,329	31,921	0	5,579	32,329	37,500
Panama	6,144	0	4,082	3,784	10,226	3,784
Paraguay	0	0	4,689	10	4,689	10
Poland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reunion	20,870	0	0	0	20,870	0
South Africa	108,809	83,897	0	6,289	108,809	90,186
Southern Rhodesia	10,598	0	0	0	10,598	0
Sweden	0	0	2	10	2	10
Turkey	6,586	56,595	7,033	7,443	13,619	64,038
United Kingdom	0	0	10	3,641	10	3,641
Venezuela	11,916	0	0	0	11,916	0
Total	1,759,156	1,405,330	27,319	54,197	1,786,475	1,459,527

Table 10.- Status of 1963 quotas and charges as of December 31, 1963

Source of supply	: Quotas : and : Prorations	: Total charges ^{1/}	Balances	
			: Total	: Direct-
			: consumption	: limits
			Short tons, raw value	
Domestic beet sugar	2,698,590 ^{2/}	2,966,000	0	
Mainland cane sugar	1,009,873	1,070,000	0	
Hawaii	1,070,000 ^{2/}	1,032,541 ^{4/}	37,459	35,542
Puerto Rico	870,000 ^{2/}	875,314 ^{3/4/}	0	1,295
Virgin Islands	15,000	15,000	0	
Total domestic	5,663,463	5,958,855	37,459	36,837
Republic of the Philippines	1,247,618	1,197,718	49,900	3,061
<u>Details for quota prorated by countries</u>				
Argentina	20,000	18,854	1,146	
Australia	43,339	43,217	122	
Belgium	182	181	1	1
Brazil	195,793	188,941	6,852	
British Honduras	10,758	1,712	9,046	
British West Indies	98,050	97,753	297	
China, Republic of	38,114	38,114	0	
Colombia	32,581		32,581	
Costa Rica	27,048	27,048	0	
Dominican Republic	336,243	321,256	14,987	
Ecuador	27,048	25,725	1,323	
El Salvador	11,065	10,361	704	
Fiji Islands	10,758	10,754	4	
French West Indies	32,581	32,581	0	
Guatemala	21,823	21,823	0	
Haiti	21,823	21,706	117	
India	21,823	21,325	498	
Ireland	10,000	9,994	6	6
Mexico	206,243	198,572	7,671	
Nicaragua	27,048	23,313	3,735	
Panama	16,290	9,949	6,341	1
Paraguay	10,758	0	10,758	
Peru	206,243	205,119	1,124	
South Africa	21,823	21,823	0	
Western Hemisphere Deficits	315,827	300,435	15,392	
Global quota: Authorized for purchase	1,725,658	1,711,114	14,544	
Total foreign countries (excluding Philippines)	<u>3,488,919</u>	<u>3,361,670</u>	<u>127,249</u>	<u>8</u>
Grand total	10,400,000	10,518,243	214,608	39,906

^{1/} Domestic beet and mainland cane sugar marketings partly estimated; all other sugar entered, authorized for entry or set aside as of December 31, 1964.

^{2/} Despite deficits declared, the quota of 2,990,127 for domestic beet sugar, 1,110,000 for Hawaii and 1,140,000 for Puerto Rico remains available.

^{3/} In addition, 287 tons of raw sugar were brought in for subsequent return to Puerto Rico.

^{4/} Includes raw sugar for direct consumption: Hawaii, 26 tons; Puerto Rico, 5,553 tons.

Table 11.- Foreign countries charges (excluding Philippines) January 1, 1963 - December 31, 1963

Source of supply	Basic	Global	Deficit	Total
Short tons, raw value				
Argentina	18,854	209,862		228,716
Australia	43,217	180,367		223,584
Belgium	181	7,365		7,546
Brazil	188,941	281,996		470,937
British Honduras	1,712			1,712
British West Indies	97,753		43,580	141,333
China, Republic of	38,114	33,155		71,269
Colombia		45,030		45,030
Costa Rica	27,048	12,984	605	40,637
Dominican Republic	321,256	197,558	71,302	590,116
Ecuador	25,725	28,156	2,601	56,482
El Salvador	10,361	6,649	1,945	18,955
Fiji Islands	10,754	37,950		48,704
France		22,935		22,935
French West Indies	32,581	60,771	945	94,297
Guatemala	21,823	16,655	12,572	51,050
Haiti	21,706	11,555	7,162	40,423
India	21,325	97,638		118,963
Ireland	9,994			9,994
Mauritius		66,605		66,605
Mexico	198,572	21,075	159,723	379,370
Nicaragua	23,313	15,176		38,489
Panama	9,949	235		10,184
Paraguay				
Peru	205,119	207,981		413,100
Reunion		9,893		9,893
South Africa	21,823	110,449		132,272
Southern Rhodesia		10,589		10,589
Turkey		6,578		6,578
Venezuela		11,907		11,907
Total	1,350,121	1,711,114	300,435	3,361,670

In addition to quantities shown, there is in Custom's custody: Hong Kong, 9 tons; Mexico, 5 tons; United Kingdom, 3 tons.

Table 12.- Quota-exempt sugar ^{1/} entered under Sections 211(a) and 212(4) as of December 31, 1963

Country	Reexport	For	Feed	Sugar under bond: for refining	Total
<u>Short tons, raw value</u>					
France			15,636		15,636
Panama			33		33
Paraguay			4,688		4,688
Reunion	10,967				10,967
Turkey			7,034		7,034
Virgin Islands				523	523
Total	10,967		27,391	523	38,881

^{1/} In addition a total of 472 tons were entered under provisions of Sec. 212; first 10 tons 323 and liquid sugar in small containers 149 tons.

Table 13.- Status of 1963 quotas and charges as of January 31, 1964

Source of supply	:	Quotas	:	:	Balances	
					:	Direct-
	:	and	:	Total 1/:	:	consumption
	:	prorations	:	charges	:	limits
Short tons, raw value						
Domestic beet sugar	2,698,590		140,000	2,558,590		
Mainland cane sugar	911,410		100,000	811,410		
Hawaii	1,110,000 ^{2/}		74,909	1,035,091		33,516
Puerto Rico	965,000		3,400	961,600		143,600
Virgin Islands	15,832		523	15,309		
Total domestic areas	5,700,832		318,832	5,382,000		177,116
Republic of the Philippines	1,137,913		40,659	1,097,254		57,679
Details for quota prorated by countries						
Argentina	20,000		2,166	17,834		
Australia	40,366			40,366		
Belgium	182			182		182
Brazil	182,363		5,648	176,715		
British Honduras	974			974		
British West Indies	91,325			91,325		
China, Republic of	35,499			35,499		
Colombia	30,346			30,346		
Costa Rica	25,193			25,193		
Dominican Republic	322,096		10,386	311,710		
Ecuador	25,193			25,193		
El Salvador	10,306			10,306		
Fiji Islands	10,020			10,020		
French West Indies	30,346			30,346		
Guatemala	20,326			20,326		
Haiti	20,326			20,326		
India	20,326			20,326		
Ireland	10,000			10,000		10,000
Mexico	192,096			192,096		
Nicaragua	25,193			25,193		
Panama	8,832			8,832		3,817
Peru	192,096			192,096		
South Africa	20,326			20,326		
Western Hemisphere Deficits	98,257		74,850	23,407		
Global quota: Authorized for purchase	1,000,000		1,000,000	0		
For later authorization	503,861			503,861		
Withheld from non-importing countries	25,407			25,407		
Total foreign countries	4,099,168		1,133,709	2,965,459		71,678
GRAND TOTAL	9,800,000		1,452,541	8,347,459		248,794

^{1/} Domestic beet and mainland cane sugar marketings partly estimated; all other sugar entered, authorized for entry or set aside as of January 31, 1964.

^{2/} Despite deficit. declared, the quota of 1,140,000 tons remains available.

Table 14.- Foreign countries charges January 1, 1964 - January 31, 1964

Source of supply	Basic	Global	Deficit	Total
Short tons, raw value				
Argentina	2,166			2,166
Australia		175,000		175,000
Belgium				
Brazil	5,648			5,648
British Honduras		5,250		5,250
British West Indies		52,170		52,170
China, Republic		48,300		48,300
Colombia				
Costa Rica		35,350	12,120	47,470
Dominican Republic	10,386	21,840		32,226
Ecuador		30,200		30,200
El Salvador		10,373		10,373
Fiji Islands		44,828		44,828
French West Indies		2,565		2,565
Guatemala		21,200		21,200
Haiti				
India		96,195		96,195
Madagascar		11,550		11,550
Mexico		222,228	62,730	284,958
Nicaragua		20,555		20,555
Panama		10,260		10,260
Philippines	40,659	46,350		87,009
Peru		33,314		33,314
South Africa		101,872		101,872
Southern Rhodesia		10,600		10,600
Total	58,859	1,000,000	74,850	1,133,709

In addition to quantities shown, there is in Custom's custody: Hong Kong, 1 ton.

Table 15.-Quota-exempt sugar ^{1/} entered under Sections 211(a) and 212(4) as of January 31, 1964

Country	For	Sugar under bond:	Total
	Reexport	Feed for refining	
Short tons, raw value			
France	1,179		1,179

^{1/} In addition a total of 56 tons were entered under provisions of Sec. 212; first 10 tons 56.

Table 16. - Primary distribution of sugar, continental United States, by States, November 1963

State and region	Cane sugar refiners	Beet sugar processors	Importers of direct- consumption sugar	Mainland cane sugar mills	Total
Hundredweights $\frac{1}{2}$					
<u>New England</u>					
Connecticut	57,782	13,685	300		71,767
Maine	29,019	1,000			30,019
Massachusetts	293,253	35,600	540		329,393
New Hampshire	14,418				14,418
Rhode Island	18,962	2,400	100		21,462
Vermont	9,393	12,812			22,205
Sub-total	422,827	65,497	940		489,264
<u>Mid-Atlantic</u>					
New Jersey	488,153	72,666	32,646	2,500	595,965
New York	921,673	194,729	15,009	4,800	1,136,211
Pennsylvania	617,087	145,722	16,366		779,175
Sub-total	2,026,913	413,117	64,021	7,300	2,511,351
<u>North Central</u>					
Illinois	556,375	1,123,716		46,286	1,726,377
Indiana	167,250	221,751			389,001
Iowa	43,389	146,134		500	190,023
Kansas	34,308	65,614		300	100,222
Michigan	148,464	312,265			460,729
Minnesota	43,274	171,486			214,760
Missouri	196,590	210,085	830	800	408,305
Nebraska	15,650	93,654		500	109,804
North Dakota	65	32,199		-1,500	30,764
Ohio	253,216	271,415			524,631
South Dakota	2,654	36,358			39,012
Wisconsin	97,303	215,149			312,452
Sub-total	1,558,538	2,899,826	830	46,886	4,506,080
<u>Southern</u>					
Alabama	119,340			4,300	123,640
Arkansas	42,075	4,406		450	46,931
Delaware	6,723				6,723
District of Columbia	16,761	800	3,214		20,775
Florida	134,868		35,165	57,595	227,628
Georgia	264,377		400	1,600	266,377
Kentucky	152,981	17,854			170,835
Louisiana	187,677			1,926	189,603
Maryland	238,444	25,900	17,997		282,341
Mississippi	65,141			1,455	66,596
North Carolina	140,627	1,000	11,830	4,280	157,737
Oklahoma	79,582	43,840			123,422
South Carolina	29,586		5,582		35,168
Tennessee	178,765	2,000			180,765
Texas	362,244	164,852	9,795	5,970	542,861
Virginia	165,542	44,500	17,693		227,735
West Virginia	23,858		705		24,563
Sub-total	2,208,591	305,152	102,381	77,576	2,693,700
<u>Western</u>					
Alaska	1,464	1,176			2,640
Arizona	37,831	25,021			62,852
California	430,925	745,116			1,176,041
Colorado	8,556	93,275			101,831
Idaho	4,532	18,479			23,011
Montana	2,070	28,861			30,931
Nevada	4,760	5,541			10,301
New Mexico	4,858	19,046			23,904
Oregon	37,187	55,801	10,070		103,058
Utah	5,946	37,494			43,440
Washington	58,493	122,983	9,900		191,376
Wyoming	507	6,749			7,256
Sub-total	597,129	1,159,542	19,970		1,776,641
<u>Grand total</u>	<u>6,813,998</u>	<u>4,843,134</u>	<u>188,142</u>	<u>131,762</u>	<u>11,977,036</u>

1/ Reported as produced or imported and delivered except liquid sugar which is on a sugar solids content basis.

Table 17. - Primary distribution of sugar, continental United States, by States, January-November 1963

State and region	Cane sugar refiners	Beet sugar processors	Importers of direct- consumption sugar	Mainland cane sugar mills	Total
Hundredweights ^{1/}					
New England					
Connecticut	1,199,084	23,484	11,005	850	1,234,423
Maine	615,520	2,000			617,520
Massachusetts	4,710,131	98,300	30,212	1,300	4,839,943
New Hampshire	328,394				328,394
Rhode Island	416,314	4,805	22,114		443,233
Vermont	218,781	30,812	5,631		255,224
Sub-total	7,488,224	159,401	68,962	2,150	7,718,737
Mid-Atlantic					
New Jersey	7,397,664	176,258	680,054	2,500	8,256,476
New York	15,132,405	731,392	620,505	21,800	16,506,102
Pennsylvania	10,208,190	716,676	783,779	600	11,709,245
Sub-total	32,738,259	1,624,326	2,084,338	24,900	36,471,823
North Central					
Illinois	8,332,743	9,849,049	4,568	126,741	18,313,101
Indiana	3,284,555	1,679,141	1,200	710	4,965,606
Iowa	586,974	1,538,272	9,439	7,638	2,142,323
Kansas	408,837	877,031		4,200	1,290,068
Michigan	2,956,278	3,207,524			6,163,802
Minnesota	434,249	1,978,848	1,000		2,414,097
Missouri	2,732,609	1,807,154	7,570	6,720	4,554,053
Nebraska	219,747	1,137,329	2,000	3,260	1,362,336
North Dakota	2,968	334,870			337,838
Ohio	6,381,735	1,511,517	8,649		7,901,901
South Dakota	26,746	363,641			390,387
Wisconsin	1,346,546	2,052,360	3,160		3,402,066
Sub-total	26,713,987	26,336,736	37,586	149,269	53,237,578
Southern					
Alabama	2,530,628		400	6,100	2,537,128
Arkansas	1,067,639	44,792		2,450	1,114,881
Delaware	196,624	3,000	4,846		204,470
District of Columbia	328,490	2,400	29,405		360,295
Florida	2,759,091		537,568	330,177	3,626,836
Georgia	5,470,577		6,385	9,860	5,486,822
Kentucky	2,317,694	33,898	100		2,351,692
Louisiana	3,366,797		5,102	49,116	3,421,015
Maryland	3,561,751	61,001	267,177		3,889,929
Mississippi	1,478,947		720	8,220	1,487,887
North Carolina	3,748,969	2,020	106,296	6,380	3,863,665
Oklahoma	1,252,087	309,541			1,561,628
South Carolina	1,728,007	400	18,489		1,746,896
Tennessee	3,496,186	8,000	200	36,303	3,540,689
Texas	6,708,475	1,439,697	101,969	8,075	8,258,216
Virginia	2,535,914	144,240	250,231		2,930,385
West Virginia	774,531	22,711	17,671		814,913
Sub-total	43,322,407	2,071,700	1,346,559	456,681	47,197,347
Western					
Alaska	40,440	15,462			55,902
Arizona	410,834	236,908			647,742
California	6,540,451	10,462,200	129,432		17,132,083
Colorado	87,429	1,170,564		1,070	1,259,063
Idaho	50,195	314,821			365,016
Montana	23,609	324,700			348,309
Nevada	72,365	56,229			128,594
New Mexico	89,962	188,128			278,090
Oregon	563,967	1,105,640	49,525	600	1,719,732
Utah	72,762	598,945		800	672,507
Washington	601,312	1,702,885	49,706		2,353,903
Wyoming	5,644	81,556			87,200
Sub-total	8,558,970	16,258,038	228,663	2,470	25,048,141
Grand total	118,821,847	46,450,201	3,766,108	635,470	169,673,626

^{1/} Reported as produced or imported and delivered except liquid sugar which is on a sugar solids content basis.

Table 18. - Primary distribution of sugar, continental United States, by states, January-November 1963

State and Region	Cane sugar refiners		Beet processors		Total all Primary Distributors ^{1/}	
	1963	1962	1963	1962	1963	1962
Thousands of hundredweights ^{2/}						
New England						
Connecticut	1,199	1,220	23		1,235	1,236
Maine	616	616	2		618	616
Massachusetts	4,710	4,696	98		4,840	4,721
New Hampshire	328	355			328	355
Rhode Island	416	442	5		443	468
Vermont	219	258	31		255	284
Sub-total	7,488	7,587	159		7,719	7,680
Mid-Atlantic						
New Jersey	7,398	6,981	176		8,257	7,619
New York	15,132	15,779	731	156	16,506	16,705
Pennsylvania	10,208	10,570	717	84	11,709	11,790
Sub-total	32,738	33,330	1,624	240	36,472	36,114
North Central						
Illinois	8,333	8,458	9,849	8,993	18,313	17,634
Indiana	3,284	3,439	1,679	1,146	4,966	4,593
Iowa	587	500	1,538	1,487	2,142	1,998
Kansas	409	393	877	911	1,290	1,307
Michigan	2,956	2,820	3,208	3,078	6,164	5,921
Minnesota	434	398	1,979	1,780	2,414	2,184
Missouri	2,733	2,624	1,807	1,691	4,554	4,343
Nebraska	220	200	1,137	1,130	1,362	1,334
North Dakota	3	2	335	287	338	289
Ohio	6,382	6,996	1,512	1,046	7,902	8,105
South Dakota	27	26	364	446	391	472
Wisconsin	1,346	1,238	2,052	2,054	3,402	3,301
Sub-total	26,714	27,094	26,337	24,049	53,238	51,481
Southern						
Alabama	2,531	2,480			2,537	2,502
Arkansas	1,068	1,094	45	25	1,115	1,119
Delaware	197	281	3		204	288
District of Columbia	328	346	2		360	390
Florida	2,759	2,450			3,627	3,533
Georgia	5,471	5,228			5,487	5,282
Kentucky	2,318	2,456	34	1	2,352	2,468
Louisiana	3,367	3,549			3,421	3,600
Maryland	3,562	3,650	61		3,890	3,952
Mississippi	1,479	1,683			1,488	1,693
North Carolina	3,749	3,637	2		3,863	3,841
Oklahoma	1,252	1,183	310	230	1,562	1,413
South Carolina	1,728	1,669	*		1,747	1,703
Tennessee	3,496	3,333	8		3,541	3,389
Texas	6,708	6,843	1,440	1,207	8,258	8,106
Virginia	2,536	2,383	144	3	2,930	2,907
West Virginia	774	891	23	13	815	929
Sub-total	43,323	43,156	2,072	1,479	47,197	47,115
Western						
Alaska	40	34	15	18	56	52
Arizona	411	388	237	241	648	629
California	6,541	7,137	10,462	9,429	17,132	16,776
Colorado	87	82	1,171	1,125	1,259	1,207
Idaho	50	59	315	297	365	356
Montana	24	23	325	319	349	342
Nevada	72	70	56	57	128	127
New Mexico	90	99	188	170	278	270
Oregon	564	631	1,106	1,138	1,720	1,855
Utah	73	62	599	611	672	674
Washington	601	673	1,703	1,683	2,354	2,447
Wyoming	6	7	81	80	87	87
Sub-total	8,559	9,265	16,258	15,168	25,048	24,822
Grand total	118,822	120,432	46,450	40,936	169,674	167,212

^{1/} Includes deliveries by importers of direct-consumption sugar and mainland cane sugar mills.

^{2/} Reported as produced or imported and delivered except liquid sugar which is on a sugar solids content basis.

* Less than 500 hundredweights.

Table 19.- Sugar prices

Year and month	: Raw cane sugar-spot price:		: Quota		: Refined beet sugar - quoted		
	: Domestic :		: premiums		: wholesale (gross)		
	: sugar at N.Y.:		: and		: Chicago-		
	: duty paid-1/:		: sugar 2/		: discounts : Eastern : West : Coast		
Cents per pound							
1959-63 Monthly average	6.69	4.10	+1.68	9.10	9.06	9.34	
1962 Monthly average	6.45	2.98	+2.58	9.07	8.95	9.07	
1963 Monthly average	8.18	8.50	-1.23	10.58	10.34	10.71	
1963							
February	6.80	6.06	-0.15	9.25	9.20	9.40	
March	7.04	6.62	-0.47	9.30	9.20	9.51	
April	8.26	7.65	-0.28	9.50	9.40	9.66	
May	11.08	10.36	-0.19	12.54	11.48	12.43	
June	8.70	9.92	-2.12	13.43	12.86	13.14	
July	7.95	9.05	-2.00	11.26	10.84	11.14	
August	6.65	6.63	-0.88	9.58	9.68	9.98	
September	7.45	7.63	-1.09	9.40	9.50	9.80	
October	9.42	10.67	-2.18	10.35	10.09	10.13	
November	9.34	11.63	-3.23	11.74	11.25	11.94	
December	8.78	10.36	-2.52	11.61	11.25	12.00	
1964							
January	9.29	10.64	-2.28	11.25	11.25	12.00	
Last 12-month average	8.40	8.94	-1.45	10.77	10.50	10.93	
Year and month	: Refined Cane Sugar - Quoted Wholesale (Gross) 4/:					: Refined	
	: North : South :					: Retail	
	: East : East : Gulf :					: U.S.	
	: East : East : Gulf :					: Average	
Cents per pound							
1959-63 Monthly average	9.94	9.69	9.65	9.33	9.34	12.02	
1962 Monthly average	9.60	9.17	9.03	9.15	9.07	11.70	
1963 Monthly average	11.94	11.45	11.30	10.90	10.71	13.58	
1963							
February	10.05	9.55	9.35	9.40	9.40	11.88	
March	10.16	9.66	9.46	9.40	9.51	11.94	
April	10.89	10.40	10.23	9.60	9.66	12.00	
May	14.09	13.22	13.98	13.87	12.43	12.74	
June	14.15	13.62	13.62	13.17	13.14	16.80	
July	13.03	12.70	12.57	11.04	11.14	15.84	
August	11.42	10.94	10.41	9.88	9.98	14.74	
September	10.76	10.59	10.10	9.70	9.80	13.46	
October	12.34	11.93	11.67	10.93	10.13	13.22	
November	13.43	13.03	12.90	12.53	11.94	14.10	
December	12.95	12.27	12.07	11.78	12.00	14.48	
1964							
January	13.06	12.49	12.38	11.45	12.00		
Last 12-month average	12.19	11.70	11.56	11.06	10.93	13.75 5/	

1/ Spot prices during 1959-60 were for sugar in bags under Contract No. 6 plus .50 cent per pound duty (Cuban). Beginning with 1961, spot prices are for bulk sugar under Contract No. 7, the terms of which are duty paid or duty free.

2/ Spot prices during 1959-60 based on No. 4 Contract which was for bagged sugar f.a.s. Cuba. Beginning with 1961 spot prices are those under No. 8 Contract which is also for bagged sugar but f.o.b. and stowed at Greater Caribbean ports (including Brazil).

3/ For 1959-60 these amounts are the difference between the spot prices of the No. 6 "Domestic" Contract rolled back to Cuba (minus freight and insurance) and the spot prices of the No. 4 "World" Contract. Beginning with 1961 the No. 7 "Domestic Bulk" Contract has been adjusted by deducting (.625¢) computed freight from Greater Caribbean ports (including Brazil), insurance and unloading charges and adding the bag allowance (currently .055¢) before calculating the differential from No. 8 "World" Contract spot prices.

4/ These are basis prices in 100-pound paper bags, NOT delivered prices. To obtain delivered prices add "Freight Prepays" and deduct discounts and allowances. For illustration see Sugar Reports No. 81, January 1959, pages 5 to 9.

5/ 11 month average

Table 20.- Wholesale prices of sugar, dextrose and corn sirup

Period	Cents per pound			Percent	
	Refined sugar	Dextrose	Corn sirup	Dextrose and corn sirup relative to refined sugar	
	wholesale Northeast ^{1/}	New York ^{2/}	New York ^{3/}	Dextrose	Corn sirup
Average 1953-62	9.10	8.23	7.26	90	80
Average 1958-62	9.41	7.49	7.25	80	77
1958	9.27	7.66	7.37	83	80
1959	9.33	7.48	7.31	80	78
1960	9.43	7.48	7.32	79	78
1961	9.40	7.45	7.23	79	77
1962	9.60	7.40	7.01	77	73
1963	11.94	8.37	7.38	70	62
<u>1963</u>					
January	9.99	7.58	7.23	76	72
February	10.05	8.10	7.23	81	72
March	10.16	8.10	7.23	80	71
April	10.89	8.10	7.23	74	66
May	14.09	8.10	7.23	57	51
June	14.15	8.25	7.48	58	53
July	13.03	8.70	7.48	67	57
August	11.42	8.70	7.48	76	65
September	10.76	8.70	7.48	81	70
October	12.34	8.70	7.48	71	61
November	13.43	8.70	7.48	65	56
December	12.95	8.76	7.48	68	58

^{1/} Gross basic price in 100 pound paper bags subject to a 2 percent cash discount.

^{2/} Hydrate, in 100 pound bags.

^{3/} In drums, price in carload lots, except beginning February 1962 for less than carload lots.
Quoted as 42 percent unmixed, except beginning March 1956, quoted as 43 percent unmixed.

Table 21. Refined sugar production and month-end stocks

Year and month	Production		Month-end stocks ^{1/}	
	Cane sugar	Beet	Cane sugar	Beet
	refiners	processors	refiners	processors
	<u>1,000 short tons, raw value</u>			
1959-63 monthly average ^{2/}	557	203	293	881
1962 monthly average	587	210	267	863
1963 monthly average ^{2/}	572	218	279	874
<u>1963</u>				
February	472	74	273	1,367
March	638	20	234	1,168
April	635	37	209	1,008
May	719	110	213	839
June	531	72	317	752
July	594	64	332	610
August	613	97	328	434
September	600	146	270	299
October	641	569	241	595
November	458	590	339	927
December ^{2/}	450	579	362	1,024
<u>1964</u>				
January ^{2/}	480	480	341	1,377
Last 12-month average	569	236	288	867

^{1/} Includes over-quota and quota exempt sugar.^{2/} Preliminary

REFERENCE GUIDE TO SUGAR REPORTS
PUBLISHED DURING 1960, 1961, 1962 and 1963

This index related to special articles published in Sugar Reports during 1960, 1961, 1962 and 1963. It supplements the reference guide in Sugar Reports No. 93, January 1960. Reference numbers are keyed in with those in Sugar Reports No. 93. Regularly recurring statistical data references appear on the title pages of applicable issues of Sugar Reports and are not included in this reference guide.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Sugar Reports</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>Page</u>
D		
I. <u>Directory</u>		
A. Categories, names and principal location of primary sugar distributors		
4. March 1961, including factory locations	107	6 - 17
5. June 1963, including factory locations	134 135	39 - 44 6
II. <u>Distribution</u>		
B. Bulk, packaged, and liquid		
3. 1957-59	100	13 - 19
4. 1957-60	109	6 - 12
5. 1961	122	10 - 17
6. 1963, First half	137	8 - 10

D (cont'd)

	<u>Sugar Reports</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>Page</u>
C. Corn sweeteners		
3. Shipments by type of buyer, quarterly		
January 1956-September 1959	93	6 - 10
H. Trends, seasonals and residuals		
2. Sugar		
d. 1959-60	101	9 - 15
e. 1960-61	114	4 - 10
f. 1961-62	126	6 - 13
J. Weights of consumer-sized packages of sugar, Survey by Food and Drug Administration		
1. 1959	101	15 - 18

G

I. Government and the Sugar Market

B. Sugar -- Where are we? -- address by Lawrence Myers, Director, Sugar Division	105	6 - 12
C. 1960 -- A Dramatic year in sugar -- address by Lawrence Myers, Director, Sugar Division	105	13 - 19
D. Special Study Group on Sugar, Summary Report -- address by Nathan M. Koffsky, Chairman	106	6 - 12
E. A Sugar Import Fee -- Address by Lawrence Myers, Director, Sugar Division	118	6 - 15

G (cont'd)

	<u>Sugar Reports</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>Page</u>
F. Sixty Years in Sugar -- by C.R.Oviatt	128	5 - 28
G. Changes and Challenges in Sugar -- Address by Lawrence Myers, Director, Sugar Division	121	16 - 23
H. Sugar and International Trade -- address by Under Secretary of Agriculture Charles S. Murphy	129	5 - 13

I

II. International Sugar Agreement

F. Statement of Lawrence Myers, Delegate of the United States of America at the International Sugar Conference, September 15, 1961	113	5 - 9
---	-----	-------

III. Imports

A. Sugar content of products	111	4 - 12
------------------------------	-----	--------

IV. Inventories and Marketing Patterns (See also stocks)

A. Beet Sugar	117	4 - 7
---------------	-----	-------

L

I. Labor productivity on sugar beet and sugarcane farms in the U.S.	115	19 - 31
--	-----	---------

P

III. Prices

F. The "Sugar dollar" from consumer to grower	108	5 - 19
G. Futures Trading in Sugar On The New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange	136	4 - 5

P (cont'd)

	Sugar Reports <u>No.</u>	<u>Page</u>
IV. <u>Production</u>		
G. U.S. producing and refining areas	107	6 - 17
H. The Possibilities of a Sugar Beet Industry in Missouri -- Address by Tom O. Murphy, Deputy Director, Sugar Division	118	16 - 23
I. The Beet Sugar Industry in Perspective for Considering Local Potentials	119	6 - 18
J. New Peaks in Farm Values for Mainland Sugar Crops	120	4 - 8

Q

I. Quotas

C. Application of statutory formulas and discretion in allocating non-quota purchase sugar for 1961	111	13 - 14
D. U.S. Sugar Quotas for foreign countries under the the Sugar Act of 1948, and successive amendments	131	6 - 11

R

I. Receipts

A. Quota sugar receipts by ports of entry, and areas of origin		
5. 1959	96	18 - 19
6. 1960 (including non-quota purchases)	108	43 - 45
7. 1961 (including non-quota purchases)	120	39 - 40
8. 1962 (including non-quota purchases)	133	44 - 45

S

Sugar Reports
<u>No.</u> <u>Page</u>

I. Stocks and Movement of Sugar (See also inventories)

A. Bulk shipments of raw sugar from Puerto Rico

1. 1954-58 (this was indexed in Sugar Reports No. 93 without a sub-number)	83	4 - 9
2. Notes on	95	7 - 8

B. "Invisible" sugar inventories

2. Industrial users, wholesalers, and
retailers

f. 1959	97	13
g. 1960	109	13
h. 1961	121	24 - 25

II. Sugar Act

A. Administration

3. New Sugar Bowls, address by Lawrence Myers, Director, Sugar Division	103	4 - 13
4. The Sugar Program at a Crossroad, address by Tom O. Murphy, Deputy Director, Sugar Division	104	6 - 13
5. Sugar Regulations and Determinations	123	8 - 10
6. Global Quotas Filled	132	5 - 7
7. Letter of May 28, 1963 to Chairman, Sub-Committee on Consumer Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives (with enclosure)	133	5 - 9
8. Statement May 29, 1963 before Committee on Finance of the U.S. Senate	133	10 - 19

S (cont'd)

	<u>Sugar Reports</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>Page</u>
9. Statement June 5, 1963 before the House Banking and Currency Committee, Consumer Affairs Sub-committee	134	5 - 16
C. Changes		
1. Proposed in Sugar Act		
c. Administration recommendations to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended	95	6 - 7
d. Summary	121	4 - 15
e. Statement of Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture	121	7 - 12
f. Statement of G. Griffith Johnson, Assistant Secretary of State	121	12 - 15
4. 1960 amendments to Sugar Act, Proclamation by the President, and subsequent actions relating to sugar supplies	99	6 - 21
	100	4 - 11
	102	8 - 10
	104	14 - 20
D. Definitions and Terms		
What is Raw Value	132	8 - 12
F. Program		
2. Including changes in 1960 and 1961	115	5 - 18
3. Including Sugar Act Amendments of 1962	124	5 - 16
III. <u>Supplies and requirements of Sugar, U.S.</u>		
F. 1959	98	6 - 13
G. Surplus and Deficit areas	107	6 - 17

S (cont'd)

	<u>Sugar Reports</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>Page</u>
H. Changing pattern of supply sources	110	2
I. 1960	110	6 - 12
J. 1961	122	4 - 9
K. Supply Actions in Transition	125	5 - 9

T

II. Transportation

A. Sugar transportation between marketing territories

1. 1955 (this was indexed in Sugar Reports 93 without a sub-number)	64	7 - 17
2. 1955-58	95	9 - 15 18
3. 1958 versus 1955	97	6 - 12

W

II. D. An 80-year prospective of world sugar	112	5 - 11
E. Charts on Sugar Supplies and Prices	133	20 - 22

SUPPLEMENT TO "SUGAR STATISTICS" VOLUME II (REVISED JULY 1963)
 AGRICULTURAL, MANUFACTURING, PAYMENT AND INCOME DATA FOR THE
 LOUISIANA AREA - 1962 CROP

VOL. II. Table 33. - Farms and acreage of sugarcane

Crop year	Farms	Acreage harvested			Acreage abandoned	Acreage harvested per farm
		For sugar	For seed	Total		
	Number	1,000 acres				Acres
1962	2,413	253.7	29.7	283.4	45.8	117.4

VOL. II. Table 34.-Number of farms by size groups: Sugarcane acreage planted ^{1/}

Crop year	Size groups of planted acres								
	0.1-4.9	5.0-9.9	10.0-24.9	25.0-49.9	50.0-99.9	100.0-199.9	200.0-499.9	500.0 & above	Total
	Number								
1962	200	211	370	453	482	342	247	108	2,413

^{1/} Acres harvested for sugar and seed, and bona fide abandoned acres within the proportionate share.

VOL. II. Table 35.-Sugarcane production and yield

Crop year	Sugarcane production			Yield of cane per harvested acre		
	For sugar	For seed	Total	For sugar	For seed	For sugar and seed
	1,000 tons			Tons		
1962	5,315	625	5,940	21.0	21.0	21.0

VOL. II. Table 36.-Manufacturing data

Crop year	Sugar produced ^{1/}			Sucrose content in cane ^{2/}	Sucrose in normal juice	Purity of normal juice	Recovery of sucrose in raw sugar from sucrose in cane ^{3/}
	Cane ground: for sugar	Total	Per ton of cane				
	1,000 tons		Pounds				
1962	5,315	472	178	8.88	10.44	12.93	75.36

^{1/} Raw value.

^{2/} Sum of sucrose in mixed juice and sucrose in bagasse.

^{3/} Sucrose recovered in sugar divided by total sucrose in cane.

VOL. II. Table 37.-Sugar Act payments to growers

Crop year	Producer- payees	Payments ^{1/}			Total	Average payment	
		For sugarcane marketed	For acreage abandonment due to disaster	For deficiency in yields		Per farm ^{2/}	Per cwt. sugar raw value
		Dollars					
1962	5,565	6,977,111	444,813	157,930	7,579,854	3,141	0.80

^{1/} Based on sugar commercially recoverable determined in accordance with the effective determinations issued pursuant to the Sugar Act.

^{2/} For number of farms see Table 33.

VOL. II. Table 38.-Value of raw sugar, molasses, and growers returns from sugarcane.

Crop year	Value from sale 1/			Growers returns from sugarcane		
	Raw sugar	Molasses	Total	Processor payments 2/	Sugar Act payments 3/	Total
1,000 dollars						
1962	61,979	6,962	68,941	42,254	7,580	49,834

1/ Seasons' average prices of raw sugar and molasses multiplied by sugar and molasses production.

2/ Seasons' average prices including molasses bonus paid by processors to growers multiplied by sugarcane production. (Tables 39, 35).

3/ Includes abandonment and deficiency payments.

VOL. II. Table 39.- Growers returns per ton of sugarcane produced for sugar.

Crop year	Basis of payment		Processor payments		Sugar Act payments		Total
	Raw sugar per pound 1/	Molasses per gallon 1/	Sugar	Molasses	Sugar	Abandonment & deficiency	
Cents			Dollars per ton				
1962	6.578	18.36	7.55	.40	1.31	.11	9.37

1/ 1962-63, October to February, inclusive

VOL. II. Table 40.-Total returns from sugar and molasses: Distribution between growers and processors 1/

Crop year	Total returns			
	Excluding Govt. payments		Including Govt. payments 2/	
	Growers	Processors	Growers	Processors
Percent				
1962	61	39	65	35

1/ Payments received by growers from processors divided by value of sugar and molasses. (Table 38).

2/ Includes abandonment and deficiency payments.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service
Washington D.C. 20250

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. Department of
Agriculture

OFFICIAL BUSINESS